

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1, 4, 8, 11, 15, and 19 have been amended. Claims 1-22 remain pending in the application. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in light of the following remarks.

### **Section 103(a) Rejection:**

The Examiner rejected claims 1-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Elmore, et al. (U.S. Publication 2006/0059107) (hereinafter “Elmore”) in view of Lipkin, et al. (U.S. Publication 2002/0120859) (hereinafter “Lipkin”), in view of Helgeson, et al. (U.S. Publication 2002/0049749) (hereinafter “Helgeson”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Regarding claim 1, the cited art fails to teach or suggest *wherein said form is one of a plurality of forms, and wherein each of the plurality of forms is mapped to a respective one of a plurality of providers of server-side processing deployed upon a server computer*. The Examiner submits that Elmore teaches a similar limitation in at least paragraph 12, which states, “...Each of the eBusiness Portals consists of a set of JavaServer Pages (JSPs) that allow for quick and easy changes to the presentation of the communications provider's portal by using standard Web development tools.” Elmore describes these eBusiness Portals as “the Internet interfaces that allow communications service providers to redefine the complete customer experience--integrating touch points across marketing, sales, ordering, billing and service into a personalized Web-based interface.” The cited passage describes that each portal (interface) includes a set of JSPs and that the way these portals are presented can be easily changed using standard Web development tools. There is nothing in this passage, or elsewhere in the cited references, that describes a plurality of forms, each of which is mapped to a respective one of a plurality of providers of server-side processing, as in Applicants’ claim.

Further regarding claim 1, the cited art fails to teach or suggest in response to receiving input indicating an action to be implemented on a first page, *generating, by the respective one of the plurality of providers, a second page in a high order presentation language*. The Examiner submits that Elmore teaches a similar limitation in at least paragraph 23, which states, “FIG. 11 is a pictorial diagram showing a sample page returned to the client via HTTP.” FIG. 11 illustrates an HTML page returned to a client to display a new trouble ticket in response to a user entering information to open a trouble ticket on the sample page illustrated in FIG. 10. However, there is nothing in Elmore that describes the page illustrated in FIG. 11 being generated by a respective one of a plurality of providers of server-side processing mapped to the form displayed in FIG. 10, as would be required by Applicants’ claim. Instead, paragraphs [0194 – 0203] describe the display of FIG. 11 as a final step in a collection of transition policy tasks that are invoked by a Web session controller to direct a user through a nested flow (a set of JSP pages) to a destination page. Applicants assert that none of the cited references describe the generation of a second page by a respective one of a plurality of providers mapped to a given one of a plurality of forms in response to input indicating an action to be taken on that form, as in Applicants’ claim.

In addition, the cited art fails to teach or suggest *wherein said generating comprises: calling a helper class method corresponding to said action*. The Examiner admits that Elmore does not disclose this limitation of claim 1 and relies on Lipkin to teach it in at least paragraph 323. The cited paragraph describes that the Business Development Kit of Lipkin provides a framework for several categories of helper classes, which are described as “additional interfaces used in conjunction with specific session bean managers.” Applicants assert that this general reference to “helper classes” teaches nothing about the above-referenced limitation, which is directed to calling a helper class method as part of generating a second page in response to receiving input indicating an action to be implemented on a first page. Applicants assert that none of the references teach or suggest this specific use of helper class methods.

The Examiner submits, “It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the electronic business system of Elmore with the business applications management system of Lipkin because it is an efficient means for providing *[sic]* required HTML web pages based on user’s inquiry.” The Examiner’s stated reason to combine the references is not supported by any evidence of record and is thus found only in hindsight. Nothing in the references describes the efficiency of helper classes of Lipkin in providing HTML web pages, as the Examiner suggests. In addition, as discussed above, the helper classes of Lipkin are not used in the manner recited in Applicants’ claims, nor is there any evidence that using them in this way would improved the efficiency of Elmore’s system, as the Examiner seems to imply. Furthermore, Applicants assert that the Examiner’s stated reason to combine the references is not commensurate with the feature of Lipkin he is attempting to combine with Elmore to result in the claimed invention. The generic mention of helper classes in the system of Lipkin have nothing to do with the limitations of claim 1 that are not taught by Elmore (e.g., calling a reusable helper class method to generate a second page in response to input indicating an action to be taken on a first page). Therefore, the Examiner’s reason to combine is improper. Applicants further assert that the system of Elmore already provides HTML pages based on a user’s inquiry without modification to include any features taught by Lipkin. Therefore, there would be no reason to look to Lipkin to provide methods for providing this information.

For at least the reasons stated above, Applicants assert that the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* rejection of claim 1.

Independent claims 1, 8, and 15 include limitations similar to those of claim 1 discussed above, and were rejected together with claim 1. Therefore, the arguments presented above apply with equal force to these claims, as well.

Applicants assert that numerous ones of the dependent claims recite further distinctions over the cited art. Applicants traverse the rejection of these claims for at

least the reasons given above in regard to the claims from which they depend. However, since the rejections have been shown to be unsupported for the independent claims, a further discussion of the dependent claims is not necessary at this time. Applicants reserve the right to present additional arguments.

## CONCLUSION

Applicants submit the application is in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is requested.

If any fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge said fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 501505/5681-91000/RCK.

Respectfully submitted,

/Robert C. Kowert/

Robert C. Kowert, Reg. #39,255  
Attorney for Applicant(s)

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C.  
P.O. Box 398  
Austin, TX 78767-0398  
Phone: (512) 853-8850

Date: May 20, 2009